



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

26

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,089	07/05/2001	Kyung-Pill Ko	P56497	3207
7590	01/12/2006		EXAMINER	
ROBERT E. BUSHNELL			HAN, QI	
SUITE 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1522 K STREET, N.W.			2654	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/898,089	KO, KYUNG-PILL	
	Examiner Qi Han	Art Unit 2654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,4-8,10,12,14,16,20,23,25 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,4-8,10,12,14,16,20,23,25 and 26 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/18/2005 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

3. This communication is responsive to the applicant's amendment and the RCE, filed on 10/18/2005. Applicant amended claims 1, 4, 6-8, 12, 14, 16, 20 and 23, canceled claims 2-3, 11, 13, 18-19, 21-22 and 24, and added new claims 25-26 (see the amendment, pages 2-8).

The examiner withdraws the claim rejection under 35 USC 112 2nd, because the applicant amended the claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim rejection under 35 USC 103, (see the amendment: pages 10-115) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of

rejection, because the amended claims introduce new issue and/or change the scope of the claims (see detail in the claim rejection below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1, 4-7, 16, 20, 23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MENEZ et al. (2002/0083453 A1), in view of HETHERINGTON et al. (6,469,713 B2) hereinafter referenced as HETHERINGTON.

As per **claim 1**, MENEZ discloses system and method for selecting language of on-screen displays (OSD) and audio programs (title), which is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant such as a Palm Pilot (which is a hand-held computer) (paragraph 21), comprising:

“a language information-providing section for storing and generating language information about a first language [used in said operating system]”, (paragraphs 12-14, ‘operated using microprocessor... a remote control device...to select the language (inherently generating the information about a kind of language)’, ‘some of setups relate to the language for feature such as on-screen display (necessarily include storing language information)’, and ‘save (store) to memory the selection of the language (first language) selected’);

“an on screen display (OSD) for generating section generating an OSD for setting a display environment of a display device”, (paragraph 20, ‘microprocessor 415 also generates the on-screen display (OSD) signals’, paragraph 10, ‘Fig. 2 shows... on-screen display (including

setting a display environment)', 'wherein menu 14 enables a user to select the language in which on-screen display will be displayed and audio programs are broadcast...');

"a memory storing a plurality of second languages used in said OSD", (Fig. 4, block 421R 'memory'; Figs. 1-3 and paragraphs 3 and 9, 'a user can select the language', 'on-screen display', 'menu enable a user to select the language', which inherently includes storing multiple languages in a storage for user selection; also see Figs. 2-3); and

"an OSD control section for determining whether said language is included in said plurality of second languages, and for [automatically] controlling said OSD generating section to display said OSD on a display section of said display device in said first language when said first language is included in said plurality of second languages as determined by said OSD control section", (paragraphs 20 and 9, 'microprocessor (or microcontroller ,or microcomputer) 415R receives ...control signals...from remote control unit 450', and 'executes (controls) the program subroutine (Fig.3) ... to provide the feature (including selecting languages)', 'menu enable a user to select (determine) the language in which on-screen displays will be displayed'; Figs. 2-3 show a plurality of languages that can be selected (controlled) for displaying in the OSD).

But, MENEZ does not expressly disclose the first language "**used in said operating system**", "**automatically controlling said OSD**" and "**whereby said language used in said OSD is automatically made to conform with said first language** used in said operation system when said first language is included in said plurality of second languages". However, the feature of providing language information used in operating system and automatically changing language setting of user interface via system messages is well known in the art as evidenced by HETHERINGTON who discloses message, system and computer program product for dynamic

language switching via messaging (title), comprising language change message for ‘changing a display language in a user interface’, providing ‘an operating system language’ and ‘permitting a run-time change of the display language employed for a user interface (**automatically** changing displaying language) (column 2, lines 20-42), and teaches that ‘system messages preferably include a language code’ such as ‘ISO Language Code’ and ‘operating system component, or dialog is preferably configured to receive (and also possible to send) language... and maybe registered as subscribers or “listeners” (which necessarily enable automatically changing language)’ (column 4, lines 5-52), ‘allows a user’s language preference to be saved and restored so that language automatically changes when the user or operator changes’ and ‘permits one application to “flip” the display of other application to a language or locale setting necessary for the applications to interact meaningfully’ (column 5, lines 59-66), ‘a determination of whether the user interface content or format requires alteration (including language change) to conform to the received system message...’ (column 6, line 40-45), which suggests that the system has capability of automatically changing language via system messages according to applications controlled by operating system for user interface (corresponding to claimed display device). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ for combining MENEZ’s OSD feature in the display device (user interface) with HETHERINGTON’s system message feature providing operating system language information and automatically changing display language in a user interface, for the purpose of employing system messages to alter a display language in a user interface (HETHERINGTON: column 1, lines 30-31).

Further, in another view, as stated above, MENEZ discloses that his invention ‘is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant (PDA) such as a Palm Pilot (a hand-held computer)’ (paragraph 21) that inherently includes a small operating system combining with memory and display, so that the operating system necessarily uses at least one of selectable languages (see Figs. 2-3) for the on-screen display, which also can read on the claimed limitation.

As per **claim 4** (depending on claim 1), MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON does not expressly discloses “said OSD control section controls said OSD generating section to display said OSD by means of one of said second languages when said first language is not included in said plurality of second languages as determined by said OSD control section”. However, the feature of using default language then there is no selection/indication of language information in the system is well known in the art as evidenced by MENEZ himself, who teaches using ‘factory default language, generally US English in the USA’ and feature of modifying ‘default language’ for user (paragraphs 13-14), which suggests that if no selection or no way to select the system is capable of using a default language setting. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON by specifically providing default language setting for on-screen displays, as taught by MENEZ, so that when no selection made or no way to select, the system can use a default language for on-screen display, just like the way that ‘the device recognizes that it is the first time it is being tuned on and prompts the user to navigate through a series of set-up screens (MENEZ: paragraph 13).

As per **claim 5** (depending on claim 4), as state above, MENEZ in view

HETHERINGTON discloses “said one of said second languages is a English” (MENEZ: Fig. 1 and paragraphs 13-14, ‘factory default language, generally US English’).

As per **claim 6**, it recites a method. The rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1.

As per **claim 7** (depending on claim 6), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 5, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 5.

As per **claim 16**, the rejection is based on the same reason described for combination of claims 1 and 4, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claims 1 and 4.

As per **claim 20** (depending on claim 16), the rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 16, because the rejection for claim 16 covers the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 20.

As per **claim 23**, it recites a method. The rejection is based on the same reason described for claim 1, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 1.

As per **claim 25** (depending on claim 7), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 5, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 5.

As per **claim 26** (depending on claim 23), the rejection is based on the same reason as described for claim 4, because the claim recites the same or similar limitation(s) as claim 4.

6. Claims 8, 10, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON, CHENG (5,986,638) and BRUCK et al. (6,008,836) hereinafter referenced as BRUCK.

As per **claim 8**, MENEZ discloses system and method for selecting language of on-screen displays (OSD) and audio programs (title), which is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant such as a Palm Pilot (which is a hand-held computer) (paragraph 21), comprising:

“a computer body generating video signal data in response to operation [of said operation], said computer body storing first language information data about said first language and generating said first language information data”, (Fig. 4 and paragraph 20 ‘microprocessor (microcomputer) control signals... sends control information to VCR (including video signal data)’, ‘also generates the on-screen display (OSD) or confirmation EPG display screen (also interpreted as video signal data); paragraph 13, ‘users could ... select different languages for the on-screen displays (necessarily generating a language information data when a language is selected); paragraph 14, ‘save (store) to memory the selection of the language (language information data) selected’, also see Fig. 4, ‘memory 421R’).

“a display device coupled to said computer body for receiving said video signal data and said first language information data, said display device displaying an on-screen display (OSD) in accordance with said first language information data” (Fig. 4 and paragraph 20, ‘television receiver 403 (display device)’, ‘microprocessor (microcomputer) 415R also generates the on-screen display (OSD) signals’, ‘microprocessor (or microcontroller ,or microcomputer) 415R receives ...control signals...from remote control unit 450’; paragraph, ‘menu enable a user to select the language in which on-screen displays will be displayed’; Figs. 2-3 show a plurality of languages (including first language) that can be selected for displaying in the OSD).

But, MENEZ does not expressly disclose the operation of said **operating system**” in the first limitation element above and “wherein said language used in said OSD is **automatically** made to conform with said first language used in said operation system”. However, the feature of providing language information used in operating system and automatically changing language setting of user interface via system messages is well known in the art as evidenced by HETHERINGTON who discloses message, system and computer program product for dynamic language switching via messaging (title), comprising language change message for ‘changing a display language in a user interface’, providing ‘an operating system language’ and ‘permitting a run-time change of the display language employed for a user interface (**automatically** changing displaying language) (column 2, lines20-42), and teaches that ‘system messages preferably include a language code’ such as ‘ISO Language Code’ and ‘operating system component, or dialog is preferably configured to receive (and also possible to send) language... and maybe registered as subscribers or “listeners” (which necessarily enable automatically changing language)’ (column 4, lines 5-52), ‘allows a user’s language preference to be saved and restored so that language automatically changes when the user or operator changes’ and ‘permits one application to “flip” the display of other application to a language or locale setting necessary for the applications to interact meaningfully’ (column 5, lines 59-66), and ‘a determination of whether the user interface content or format requires alteration (including language change) to conform to the received system message...’ (column 6, line 40-45), which suggests that the system has capability of automatically changing language via system messages according to applications controlled by operating system for user interface (corresponding to the display device). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify MENEZ for combining MENEZ's OSD feature in the display device (user interface) with HETHERINGTON's system message feature providing operating system language information and automatically changing display language in a user interface, for the purpose of employing system messages to alter a display language in a user interface (HEITHERINGTON: column 1, lines 30-31).

Event though MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON discloses "a memory for storing said first language information data" (MENEZ: paragraph 13, 'save (store) to memory the selection of the language selected'), MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON does not expressly teach whether the display device comprises a memory for storing languages information, or not. However, the feature is well known in the art as evidenced by CHENG who discloses a computer monitor (display device) comprising memory 40 to preserve the video display parameters, including language (Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 20-24 and line 47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON for providing a computer monitor (display device) with a memory for storing video display parameters including language information, for the purpose of providing more user friendly environment (CHENG: column 1, lines 48-49).

Further, in another view, as stated above, MENEZ discloses that his invention 'is equally applicable to a wireless personal assistant (PDA) such as a Palm Pilot (a hand-held computer)' (paragraph 21) that inherently includes a small operating system combining with memory and display, so that the operating system necessarily uses at least one of selectable languages (see Figs. 2-3) for the on-screen display, which also can read on the claimed limitation.

Moreover, Even though MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON and CHENG discloses “to display said OSD in said first language when said first language information data is included in said plurality of second languages information data” (see above), MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON and CHENG does not expressly disclose the display device “comprising a first key activating said OSD and a second key setting said display device” for the OSD features. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by BRUCK who discloses method and apparatus for adjusting television display control using a browser (title), comprising ‘display device using a web browser’ (column 4, lines 1-2) and ‘the on-screen display controls are controlled and manipulated using the television controls’ that ‘invokes (activates) the on-screen menu ...through front panel buttons 8 (keys)’ (Fig. 1B and column 7, line 60 to column 8, line 2), which suggests that system has capability of implementing the claimed functionality. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON and CHENG for providing a display device with keys for invoking and setting OSD and display features, as taught by BRUCK, for the purpose of providing directly and/or typically controllable buttons for user convenience (BRUCK: column 7, line 60 to column 8, line 2).

As per **claim 10** (depending on claim 8), MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON, CHENG and BRUCK further discloses “said display device displays a visual image in accordance with said video signal data”, (CHENG: Fig. 2 and column 1, lines 40-44, ‘computer monitor in which the icons (visual image) representing the monitor display parameters (interpreted as video signal data)').

As per **claim 12** (depending on claim 8), MENEZ in view of HETHERINGTON, CHENG and BRUCK further discloses “an OSD generator for generating said OSD; and an OSD controller coupled; and an OSD controller coupled between said computer body and said OSD generator for controlling said OSD generator to display said OSD in said first language when said first language information data is included in said of second language information data” (MENEZ: Figs. 1-4 and paragraph 20, see claim 8 above; CHENG: Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 10-46, ‘a computer monitor comprising an on-screen display integrated circuit (OSD IC) 60 (OSD generator)’, ‘a microprocessor based controller comprising a central processing unit 20...’ and ‘on-screen display (OSD) manager’).

As per **claim 14** (depending on claim 8), MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON, CHENG and BRUCK does not expressly discloses “said display device displaying said OSD in accordance with one of said plurality of second language information data **when said plurality of second language information data does not include said first language information data**”. However, the feature of using default language then there is no selection/indication of language information in the system is well known in the art as evidenced by MENEZ himself, who teaches using ‘factory default language, generally US English in the USA’ and feature of modifying ‘default language’ for user (paragraphs 13-14), which suggests that if no selection or no way to select, the system is capable of using a default language. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify MENEZ in view HETHERINGTON by specifically providing default language setting for on-screen displays, as taught by MENEZ, so that when no selection made or no way to select, the system can use a default language for on-screen display, just like the way that ‘the device recognizes that it is the

first time it is being tuned on and prompts the user to navigate through a series of set-up screens (MENEZ: paragraph 13).

Conclusion

7. Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Mail Stop _____
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
or faxed to: 571-273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)
Or: 571-273-8300, (for informal or draft communications, and please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

If no Mail Stop is indicated below, the line beginning Mail Stop should be omitted from the address.

Effective January 14, 2005, except correspondence for Maintenance Fee payments, Deposit Account Replenishments (see 1.25(c)(4)), and Licensing and Review (see 37 CFR 5.1(c) and 5.2(c)), please address correspondence to be delivered by other delivery services (Federal Express (Fed Ex), UPS, DHL, Laser, Action, Purolater, etc.) as follows:

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Customer Window, Mail Stop _____
Randolph Building
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qi Han whose telephone numbers is (571) 272-7604. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil, can be reached on (571) 272-7602.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Inquiries regarding the status of submissions relating to an application or questions on the Private PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028 between the hours of 6 a.m. and midnight Monday through Friday EST, or by e-mail at: ebc@uspto.gov. For general information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

QH/qh
December 28, 2005



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER